

Amendments to the Drawing

Enclosed is Replacement Sheet 1 showing amendments to FIGS. 1, 2a, and 2b. Also enclosed is New Sheet 2 adding FIGS. 3 and 4.

#### Remarks

Claims 1-7 were pending in the application. Claims 1-7 were rejected. No claims were merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By the foregoing amendment, no claims are canceled, claims 1-6 are amended, and claims 8-11 are added. No new matter is presented.

#### Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a).

First, the Office included a long list of claim elements which are asserted not shown in the drawings. Different issues attend different ones of the Office's identified element. The foregoing amendment to the drawing and specification labels the goods compartment opening as 14 and the longitudinal axis as 20. The blind carrier shaft is already labeled as 4 but the *Ipsis verbis* antecedent has been added in paragraph 0018. As for the refrigerated cabinet, refrigerated chest, freezer chest, refrigerated shelf cabinet, and freezer shelf cabinet, these terms all designate basic species of a refrigerated case commonly known in the art. The foregoing amendment generically identifies this with the reference numeral 10. Because these features are well known, schematic representation is clearly appropriate. The goods compartment has been identified via the numeral 12. The means for connecting has similarly been illustrated schematically with the element 30.

Similarly, new FIGS. 3 and 4 and the associated text show the holes/perforations. Such known features are appropriately shown in schematic form. Specifically, FIG. 3 generically schematically shows the hole arrays. This encompasses both uniform arrays and the claim 5 perforation in a different manner across the area. FIG. 4 shows holes in the upper portion.

The Office asserted that FIG. 2a must be marked as "PRIOR ART" which has been done.

Finally, the Office asserted: "The drawing sheet numbering must be clear and larger than the numbers used as reference characters to avoid confusion." The amendment increases such font size. However, clearly the existing drawings were not even remotely confusing.

#### Specification

The title was objected to as not being descriptive. The Office did not make any particular suggestion or indicate any particular deficiency. Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing examination, Applicants made the foregoing clarifying amendment.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(2). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office listed numerous asserted informalities in the claims. These have been corrected as proposed without need for further elaboration other than with respect to claim 5. As is discussed above, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand claim 5 and know how to practice it. The claim is not insolubly ambiguous. For antecedent basis, the claim has been amended to use the word “portions” consistent with paragraph 0025. If, however, the Office still believes further amendment is required, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to discuss.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto (JP2001123766). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office asserted that “at least one of the rolling night blinds comprises at least one loose bearing (8) such that the rolling night blind... can be supported so as to be slidable along the longitudinal axis of its blind carrier shaft...” There are several clear deficiencies. First, reference to numeral 8 is well beyond the level of detail in the English language abstract of Yamamoto. There is clearly no basis for the assertions regarding element 8. If this rejection is to be maintained, the Office must provide a full translation and appropriate analysis. At best (worst) element 8 appears to be one of several intermediate rollers. No relationship to bearings appears clear.

Furthermore, no relationship to the claimed slidable movement is found. At best (worst?) element 8 merely allows the blind to be rolled and unrolled over element 8 while not permitting sliding in the direction of its carrier shaft. This further appears to be confirmed by the apparent relationship between Yamamoto elements 18 and the elements (rails?) 19.

New claim 8 yet further distinguishes this by identifying the bearing as supporting the roll on which the blind rolls up and from which the blind is rolled out. Support for this is seen in claim 1 and paragraph 0018. Claims 9 and 10 are supported by claim 2, and claim 11 is supported by claim 3.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 7, 8, 13, and 14 (believed 4-7) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Ibrahim (US4537040). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Ibrahim does not cure the deficiency of the underlying Yamamoto rejection. At page 6 of the Office action, factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere* were listed. However, no findings were made relative to such inquiries.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and further examination are requested. Please charge any fees or deficiency or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By /William B. Slate, #37238/  
William B. Slate  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628  
Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: May 6, 2009

Enclosures: Replacement Sheet 1; New Sheet 2